

REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-20. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. No new matter has been added. For example, support for amendments to Claims 1 and 7 can be found, among other places, in the first sentence of paragraph 0027 and original Claim 15 of the instant application, serial no. 10/769,371. The first sentence of paragraph 0027, states, "...a route path is determined 504 for each address." Original Claim 15 recites, "determining a first address of an interface of a server and a second address of the interface of the server; determining a first route path for the first address...determining a second route path for the second address..."

Applicants respectfully submit that the next Office Action should not be a final Office Action because the amendments made in this response would not cause a new search to be performed. For example, the amendments to correct the antecedent basis in Claims 1 and 7 are supported by original Claim 15.

OFFICE ACTION'S FORMAT

The Office Action dated December 6, 2006 did not cite portions of reference(s) for each limitation of each claim for the claim sets 7-14 and 15-20. The format of the Office Action appears to misquote these claims as well as making it difficult for Applicants to respond to the Office Action. For example, the Office Action states, "except for system comprising server interfaces, gateways, LUN, switches..." Applicants are left wondering which of the claims in claim set 7-14 the Office Action is referring to. Claim 7 does not recite, among other things, a LUN or a switch. Applicants respectfully request that future Office Actions cite portions of reference(s) for each limitation of each claim as was done for the claim set 1-6.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0175341 (referred to hereinafter as "Ovadia") in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0129005 by Srikrishna (referred to hereinafter as "Srikrishna"). Applicants respectfully submit that embodiments of the present invention are neither taught nor suggested by Ovadia or Srikrishna, alone or in combination.

Claim 1 recites,

At least one machine-readable media comprising:

first program code to determine a route path through a gateway to a storage area network (SAN) for each of a plurality of addresses of an interface of a server, the first program code to determine a particular route path from the plurality of route paths by applying an algorithm to one or more numerical values associated with a particular address that is one of the plurality of addresses; and

second program code to configure the gateway with the particular route path.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ovadia does not teach or suggest "...a plurality of addresses of an interface of a server, the first program to determine a particular route path from the plurality of route paths by applying an algorithm to one or more numerical values associated with a particular address that is one of the plurality of addresses; second program code to configure the gateway with the particular route path," as recited by Claim 1.

Ovadia teaches a method and system for routing high-speed data to and from SANs (Storage Area Networks and Server Area Networks) via optical burst switch (OBS) networks. The Office Action asserts that Ovadia teaches "a plurality of addresses of an interface of a server" at the abstract, figure 2, and Claims 30, 31, and 42 on page 182. None of these portions of Ovadia mention an interface of a server or a plurality of addresses of an interface of a server. Claim 42 does mention a destination address and routes stored in a routing table. However, there is nothing in Claim 42 about "an interface of a server," "a plurality of addresses of an interface of a server," or determining "a particular route path from the plurality of route paths," as recited by Claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that Ovadia teaches "the first program code to determine the route path" at Figure 2 and paragraph 0085 on page 7. However, there is nothing in Figure 2 about "determining a particular route path from the plurality of route paths" of an interface of a server.

Applicants respectfully agree with the Office Action's admission that Ovadia does not teach "an algorithm to one or more numerical values associated with a particular address that is one of the plurality of addresses."

The Office Action asserts that Ovadia teaches “second program code to configure the gateway with the particular route path,” as recited by Claim 1 at Figure 2, paragraph 0090 on page 7 and paragraphs 0103-0104 on page 8. Figure 2 shows nothing about “configuring,” “configuring a gateway,” or “configure the gateway with the particular route path.” Paragraph 90 mentions PBS generic burst header 702, PBS burst length field 722, PBS burst payload 704, and PBS burst length field. However, paragraph 90 mentions nothing about “configuring,” “configuring a gateway,” or “configure the gateway with the particular route path.” Paragraphs 0103 and 0104 mention PBS payload header 732, control channel wavelength field 820, PBS payload header 732 and data channel wavelength field 822. However paragraphs 0103 and 0104 say nothing about “configuring,” “configuring a gateway,” or “configure the gateway with the particular route path.”

Srikrishna does not remedy the deficiency in Ovadia in that neither Srikrishna nor Ovadia teach or suggest, “...a plurality of addresses of an interface of a server, the first program to determine a particular route path from the plurality of route paths by applying an algorithm to one or more numerical values associated with a particular address that is one of the plurality of addresses; second program code to configure the gateway with the particular route path” as recited by Claim 1 for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully agree that Srikrishna does not teach “first program code to determine a route path through a gateway to a storage area network (SAN) for each of a plurality of addresses of an interface of a server, the first program code to determine a particular route path from the plurality of route paths by applying ...second program code to configure the gateway with the particular route path,” as recited by Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action’s assertion that Srikrishna teaches “...an algorithm to one or more numerical values associated with a particular address that is one of the plurality of addresses” of the interface of the server at Figure 5 and paragraphs 0063-0070. While Srikrishna teaches how to test wireless routes, and how to choose optimum ones of the wireless routes, Srikrishna does not teach that a route path can be determined “by applying an algorithm to one or more numerical values associated with a particular address” an interface of a server. Rather, Srikrishna only teaches, “A first step 510 [that] includes receiving

routing packets...; each routing packet including route information that identifies the wireless route of the routing packet.” See, Srikrishna, par. [0065]. Note that Srikrishan fails to specify how the “route information” is determined, or whether it is based on “numerical values associated with a particular address” of an interface of a server. The last Office Action dated December 6, 2006 did not address Applicants’ arguments with respect to Srikrishna. Applicants respectfully request that the next Office Action respond to Applicants arguments.

For the foregoing reasons, independent Claim 1 should be patentable. For similar reasons independent Claims 7 and 15 should also be patentable. Claims 2-6 depend on Claim 1. Claims 8-14 depend on Claim 7. Claims 16-20 depend on Claim 15. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective independent claims. Further, these dependent claims include additional limitations which further make them patentable. Therefore, these dependent claims should be patentable for at least the reasons that their respective independent claims should be patentable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections of record. For reasons discussed herein, Applicant respectfully requests that Claims 1-20 be considered by the Examiner. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Dated: 3/5/, 2007

Address:

Telephone:

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



John P. Wagner Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, California 95076 USA

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 234-3749 Direct/Cell
(408) 763-2895 Facsimile